

## REMARKS

In response to the above identified Office Action, Applicant has amended the application and respectfully request reconsideration thereof.

### *Amendment of Claims*

Claims 1, 11 and 18 have been amended to include subject matter corresponding substantially to that of cancelled claims 2, 16 and 24 respectively.

### *Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Cameron, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,062).

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) have been overcome and is addressed for the reason that Cameron does not disclose each and every limitation of the claim 1, as amended, of the present application.

Claim 1 includes the following limitation:

wherein the content management system is to provide...results having personalized content ....

The Office Action, in rejecting claim 1, contends that the above limitation is anticipated by the following disclosure in Cameron:

FIG. 17 presents the detailed logic associated with the many different methods for accessing this centrally stored profile. The profile database 1710 is the central storage place for the users' profile information. The profile gateway server 1720 receives all requests for profile information, whether from the user himself or merchants trying to provide a service to the user. The profile gateway server is responsible for ensuring that information is only given out when the profile owner specifically grants permission. Any device that can access the public Internet 1730 over TCP/IP (a standard network communications protocol) is able to request information from the profile database via intelligent HTTP requests. Consumers will be able to gain access to services from devices such as their televisions 1740, mobile phones, Smart Cards, gas meters, water meters, kitchen appliances, security systems, desktop computers, laptops, pocket organizers, PDAs, and their vehicles, among others. Likewise, merchants 1750 will be able to access those profiles (given permission from the consumer who owns each profile), and will be able to offer customized, personalized services to consumers because of this.

Col. 42, lines 7-27.

The above quote describes processing a request for user profile information. The profile gateway server ensures that user profile information is only given out when the profile owner grants permission. Any device that can access the public Internet over TCP/IP is able to request user profile information.

Claim 1 requires a method whereby the content management system is to provide...results having personalized content. "Results" include user data and content, as implied by the phrase "personalized content". In contrast, the above quote from Cameron does not describe content, much less personalized content. The above quote

from Cameron describes user profile information. Cameron therefore cannot be said to anticipate the above quoted limitation because Cameron describes user profile information and claim 1 requires results having personalized content.

In summary, Cameron does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1, as required to support a rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

As dependent claims are deemed to include all limitation of claims from which they depend, the rejection of claims 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. is 102(e) is also addressed by the above remarks, and the amendments contained herein.

Claim 11, as amended, includes the following limitation:

retrieving a first content by a first service point using results from a first analysis; and retrieving a second content by a second service point using the results from the first analysis.

The Office Action, in rejecting claim 11, contends that the above limitation is anticipated by the following disclosure in Cameron:

FIG. 15 describes the process for generating the page that displays the agent's current statistics. When the user requests the agent statistics page 1510 with the client browser, the server retrieves the users' statistics 1520 from the users' profile database 1530. The server then performs the mathematical calculations necessary to create a normalized set of statistics 1540. The server then retrieves the formulas 1550 from the content database 1560 that will be used to calculate the user-centric statistics. Graphs are then generated 1570 using the generic formulas and that user's statistics. These graphs are inserted into a template to create the statistics page 1580. This page is then returned to the user 1590.

Col. 41, lines 8-20.

The above quote describes the generating a page that displays the agent's current statistics and returning the page to the user. Further, the above quote twice is referenced twice with respect to the above limitation. The first reference corresponds to retrieval by a first service point and the second reference corresponds to retrieval to a second service point.

Claim 11 requires a method whereby retrieval is made from a first service point and a second service point. In contrast, the above quote from Cameron does not describe retrieval from a first service point and a second service point; but rather indicates that the page is returned to the user. Indeed, the above quote is silent with respect to the user's means of retrieval. Cameron therefore cannot be said to anticipate the above quoted limitation because Cameron does not describe a means of retrieval and claim 11 requires a method whereby retrieval is made from a first service point and a second service point.

In summary, Cameron does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 11, as required to support a rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claim 18 includes a limitation corresponding substantially to the above-discussed limitation of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the above remarks and amendments contained herein also be considered when examining these other independent claims for allowability.

As dependent claims are deemed to include all limitation of claims from which they depend, the rejection of claims 12-15, 17, 19-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. is 102(e) is also addressed by the above remarks, and the amendments contained herein.


In summary, Applicant believes that all rejections presented in the Office Action have been fully addressed and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant furthermore believes that all claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact André Marais at (408) 947-8200.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 05/05/ 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
André L. Marais  
Reg. No. 48,095

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200